DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 912 HE 026 112

AUTHOR Daly, Fran; Townsend, Barbara K.
TITLE Faculty Perceptions of the Department Chair's Role in Facilitating Tenure Acquisition. ASHE Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Minneapolis, MN, October 29-November 3, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; College Faculty; *Department Heads; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; *Nontenured Faculty; Postsecondary Education; *Promotion (Occupational); Role Perception; Science Curriculum; Teaching (Occupation); *Tenure; Tenured Faculty; Units of Study; Universities
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; Biglan Model

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper was to determine faculty perceptions about the role a department chair does and should play in a faculty member's movement toward tenure. A group of 485 full-time, tenured, and tenure-track faculty from 13 U.S. doctorate-granting universities participated in the study. Answers to the following questions were solicited: (1) which department chairs' role are perceived as facilitating tenure acquisition? (3) Do chairs' roles in facilitating tenure vary by discipline (when classified according to the Biglan model of disciplinary differences)? and (3) Do tenured professors and tenure-track professors differ in their perceptions of chairs' roles that would facilitate tenure acquisition? Results of the study indicate that faculty believe that the department chair can and should play an important role in tenure acquisition, although some felt their department head may lack the knowledge and/or authority to do so. Faculty also expressed the need to have their department heads secure funding for various events, such as professional meetings. It was found as well that perceptions of faculty members reinforce the belief that the department head both could and should serve as a mentor for junior faculty. Other findings showed that the role of the department chair in facilitating tenure acquisition varied by type of discipline (e.g., hard-pure, soft-pure, etc.) and that tenure-track faculty more acutely perceived the importance of the chair's facilitative roles than did tenured faculty. (Contains 49 references.) (GLR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352912

Faculty Perceptions of the Department Chair's Role in Facilitating Tenure Acquisition

Fran Daly
Loyola University of Chicago

Barbara K. Townsend
Loyola University of Chicago

HE 026 112

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Fran Daly

Barbara K. Townsend

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Texas A&M University
Department of Educational
Administration
College Station, TX 77843
(409) 845-0393

ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

This paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Marriott City Center, Minneapolis, Minnesota, October 29 - November 1, 1992. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.

Faculty Perceptions of the Department Chair's Role in Facilitating Tenure Acquisition

Fran Daly
Loyola University of Chicago

Barbara K. Townsend
Loyola University of Chicago

Introduction

The tenure system is the most distinctive feature of American academic life (AAUP, 1984). Tenure is "an arrangement under which faculty appointments in an institution of higher education are continued until retirement" unless a faculty member is unable to fulfill his or her duties or the institution is experiencing financial exigency (Chait & Ford, 1984, p.172). Obtaining tenure is the "rite of passage" into the full benefits of the professoriate: job security and academic freedom.

Partially because of its significance, tenure is not an automatic privilege afforded to every beginning faculty member. At four-year institutions, tenure-track faculty typically undergo a probationary period of six years during which time they must demonstrate their "professional competence and responsibility" (Van Alstyne, 1971). During the last year of probation, their tenured colleagues, or some subset thereof, evaluate the junior faculty member's performance and recommend that she or he be granted or denied tenure.

Statistics indicate that as many as 3,000 faculty are denied tenure per year in American colleges and universities (Atelsek & Gomberg, 1980). When a faculty member is dismissed, there are both individual and institutional costs. Burke (1987) found that 40 percent of those denied tenure from four-year institutions left academic life. Those who remain in academe find another faculty position, usually at a less prestigious institution (Bowen & Schuster, 1986). From the individual's perspective, several years worth of time and energy may have essentially been wasted when one is denied tenure. Junior faculty "believe that to fail (be denied tenure) in their present position is not only the loss of a job; it is the end of a career" (Wylie, 1985, p.2).

Denial of tenure to individual faculty also has ramifications for the institution. For remaining colleagues, there are psychological costs involved, such as a sense of loss, lowered morale, and even a sense of failure. Browne and Reed (1992) explained that their department, at a Doctorate Granting I institution, had lost a substantial number of promising tenure track faculty in the last twenty years. They questioned whether a junior faculty's "inability to secure tenure was not as much the fault of the tenured faculty as it was those we were judging" (p.1). Tenured faculty members presumably feel a responsibility to assist the junior faculty. When tenure is denied to junior faculty, the entire faculty may experience a sense of failure. In many institutions, these same faculty helped select the now rejected junior faculty member. As Burke (1987) explained, "the department may have failed to provide a supportive environment" (p.192). Also, from the institution's perspective there is considerable monetary expense, as well as time, incurred in hiring a faculty member to replace the one denied tenure.

Institutions may be justified in their decision to deny tenure because the junior faculty member failed to meet research, teaching, and/or service requirements that were outlined in the department's guidelines for promotion and tenure. However, there are capable and talented junior faculty members who are denied tenure by institutions for reasons that might have been avoided if someone had assisted junior faculty members in discovering what was really expected of them. As Whitt (1991) pointed out, there appears to be "a difference between doing your best and doing the right things." Junior faculty must be socialized to "do the right thing" in order to succeed (p.190).

Conceptual Framework

An important factor influencing tenure acquisition is the socialization of the assistant professor into academic life, at both the institutional and disciplinary level. Many authors have indicated that the socialization process, particularly the mentor relationship, is critical to the success, defined here as the receipt of tenure, of a faculty member (Bess, 1978; Boice, 1992; Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Burke, 1987; Clark, 1985; Clark & Corcoran, 1986; Creswell & Bean, 1981; Lincoln, 1986; Lovano-Kerr & Fuchs, 1983; and Shulman, 1979).

The junior faculty person may arrive at he/his first faculty position with some erroneous impressions of the faculty role (Van Maanen, 1976). In order for the faculty member to be successful, these incorrect impressions must be remedied in the first years on the job (Van Maanen, 1976). A faculty member goes through a "re-socialization" upon entering her/his first faculty position (Bess 1978). The purpose of this resocialization "is to make up for or correct some deficiency in earlier socialization" (Wheeler, 1966, p. 68). Lincoln (1986) described the transition to a faculty position, as a "leap to the other side of the desk" from graduate school into the professoriate (p.114) and stated that it requires a "profound leap" to make this transition.

> The skills and abilities needed to successfully depart from the graduate school experience are simply not the same as those required for the march toward tenure, to work productively with graduate and undergraduate students, to mentor students of one's own, or to take the conceptual and professional steps leading to tenure and promotion (p.114).

The expectations for teaching, research and service may be more than the junior professor is able to meet successfully. Women have a more difficult time in making this transition to the professoriate because of the lack of "mentorship". Because of this type of socialization handicap, "not everyone (especially women) is willing to undergo the emotional and psychological trauma involved" in making the transition from graduate student to faculty member (Lincoln, p.113).

When Lovano-Kerr and Fuchs (1983) conducted a study on concerns of tenure-track faculty regarding retention, professional development and quality of work life, they discovered significant socialization issues. Lovano-Kerr and Fuchs found that half of the junior faculty said it was exceedingly critical to have a mentor in acquiring tenure. However, tenure-track faculty indicated their most pressing need was for assistance in

conducting research. The Lovano-Kerr and Fuchs study clearly ties the issues of socialization and tenure together and suggests the importance of further examination of the relationship between socialization and the receipt of tenure.

One key person in the socialization process of junior faculty members is the department chair. Among his or her many duties, a chair serves a "facilitating function" (Roach, 1976). In other words, the chair can help colleagues, both tenured and tenure-tr to grow and develop. Whitt (1991) found that "department chairs are 'crucial' in the adjustment of new faculty" (p.186). Wylie (1985) explains that "new faculty often look to their department chair for support and assistance in understanding the scope of their responsibilities" (p.10).

Any examination of the department chair's role in facilitating tenure and socializing junior faculty needs to recognize possible differences in role because of the academic discipline of the department chair. Clark (1989) suggested that the American professioriate is largely differentiated by discipline and "disciplinary differences alone demand a more exacting approach in which the field of competence and study is front and center" (p.4). Biglan's (1973a, 1973b) work has demonstrated that academic disciplines have distinct properties that direct the way a faculty member from a particular discipline conducts research, administrative duties, service and teaching. Therefore an examination of the facilitation role of the chair should include recognition of differences by discipline.

Biglan's Model

In his study of the characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas, Biglan (1973a) found three dimensions common to academic areas: (a) existence of a paradigm or model, (b) concern with application, and (c) concern with life systems (p.195). He created a three-dimensional classification system or model that identifies 36 academic subject areas and groups them into one of eight categories. The initial dimension, and the most pronounced in terms of the variance it accounted for, is labelled hard - soft. It distinguishes between disciplines with a clearly defined paradigm such as the hard sciences (i.e., biology) from disciplines without a distinct paradigm such as social sciences (i.e., sociology). The more scientific disciplines with clearly defined paradigms such as physics, math, chemistry are considered to reflect the hard dimension and the less defined paradigms such as education and political science, are considered to reflect the soft dimension. The second dimension, pure - applied, indicates the relative concern of the discipline with the practical application of the subject matter. English would be considered a pure subject because it is not concerned with practical use whereas accounting would be considered an applied subject because of its practical nature. The third dimension, labelled non-life - life, indicates whether or not the discipline deals with inorganic or living systems. Micro-biology and agriculture would be considered life systems whereas disciplines such as engineering, mathematics and physical sciences would be considered non-life systems because they concern themselves with inanimate subject matter.

Biglan (1973b) also studied social connectedness (which means that a person likes his or her co-workers, is influenced by them and collaborates with them) and scholarly output (which refers to publishing monographs and journals, directing dissertations, and the quality

of each) to classify graduate departments at the university in which he conducted his initial study. His purpose was to investigate cooperative efforts in teaching and research activities; commitment to teaching, research, administration, and service; and publications among the fields as classified on his model.

Biglan found that "hard" dimension faculty collaborated more in teaching, research, and co-authorships than did "soft" dimension faculty. "Hard" dimension faculty were more committed to research, and "soft" dimension faculty members were more committed to teaching. On the pure/applied dimension, "applied" faculty described greater collaboration efforts than did "pure" dimension faculty. The "pure" faculty preferred research, while "applied" faculty preferred service activities. On the life/non-life dimension, faculty in the "life" area preferred collaborative activities related to teaching and reported greater collaboration on research goals than did faculty members in nonlife areas. "Non-life" dimension faculty preferred teaching more than "life" dimension faculty. Clearly, Biglan's studies indicate disciplinary differences in expectations about what successful faculty will do. These disciplinary differences need to be considered in understanding a chair's role in helping faculty achieve tenure.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty perceptions about the role a department chair does and should play in a faculty member's movement toward tenure. The objectives included answering the following research questions: 1) Which department chairs' roles are perceived as facilitating tenure acquisition?, 2) Do chairs' roles in facilitating tenure vary by discipline (when classified according to the Biglan model of disciplinary differences)?, and 3) Do tenured professors and tenure track professors differ in their perceptions of chairs' roles that would facilitate tenure acquisition?

Methodology

The population for this study was all full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty in the 51 Doctorate-granting I Universities in the United States. From 13 (25 percent) of these institutions, a sample of 775 faculty was randomly selected from all the full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty in chemistry, computer science, economics and English departments. These departments were selected to represent four dimensions of Biglan's model. English represented the soft-pure dimension, economics the soft-applied, chemistry the hard-pure, and computer science the hard-applied. The dimension of non-life/life was excluded because a random sample of the institutions indicated that the non-life/life dimension was infrequently represented. Other studies utilizing the Biglan model, e.g. Neal 1991; and Kolb 1981, have applied this model excluding this dimension.

Doctorate-Granting I faculty were selected for several reasons: 1) This area of higher education faculty represents a significant segment of all the higher education faculty, (approximately 25,000); 2) Faculty in this institutional type have not been studied as frequently as faculty in Research universities and Liberal Arts colleges, and 3) The choice of a single institutional type helps to strengthen findings by controlling for variation by

institutional type. Only tenured and tenure-track junior faculty were included because of the study's focus on what a chair can do to facilitate a faculty member's attainment of tenure.

Each of the 775 faculty members in the sample was mailed a three-part researcher-designed questionnaire. The first part asked faculty to indicate the extent to which 19 department chair roles did or would assist the respondent in achieving tenure. The nineteen duties of the department chair (See Table 3 for complete listing of the duties) had been selected from the various tasks most frequently identified by Bennett and Figuili (1990), Bennett (1989), Bragg (1981), Brann (1972), Heimler (1972), Hill and French (1967), McLaughlin (1975), Siever, Loomis and Neidt (1972), Smart and Elton (1976), and Tucker (1984), as duties and tasks performed by department chairs. The second part asked the respondents to approximate how much the activities of research, teaching and service contributed to the achievement of tenure at their institution. The third part requested information on demographic and academic characteristics of the respondents.

A response rate of 62.58% was achieved. The responses varied by academic area: 215/350 (61.4%) responses (English), 99/160 (61.88%) in economics, 65/106 (61.3%) computer science and 106/159 (66%) chemistry. There were 485 (out of 775) usable questionnaires. Also, 35% of the respondents made comments.

Data Analysis

The hypotheses tested examined the relationship between the independent variables of departmental affiliation and tenure status (also a control variable) and the dependent variable of the facilitation role of the chair. Data analysis included the tabulation of item responses, the cross tabulation of variables, the computation of descriptive statistics, chi-square analysis, and analysis of variance. In addition, Tukey's comparison of means tests (ANOVA) were performed to analyze the second research question (see Purpose and Objectives) to identify which specific departments were causing the effects shown by the chi-square tests. Statistical significance was designated at the .05 level.

Results

Demographic information for all respondents. Demographic and academic characteristics of all the respondents are presented in Table 1. Respondents included almost four times as many men than women. Less than ten percent of the respondents were minorities. Almost all the respondents held a doctorate. The tenure to tenure-track ratio was 4:1. The professors were well represented by almost 45% of the sample, followed by associate professor with 34% and almost 20% of the sample were assistant professors. The mean age was approximately 48 years old. Overall, the sample consisted largely of tenured middle-aged, white males with doctorates. Demographic data collected in this study appear to reflect the national averages (The National Center for Education Statistics, 1990).

Table 1

Demographic and Academic Characteristics of Total Respondents N=485			
Gender N= 484	Female	102	21.03%
	Male	382	78.96%
Racial/Ethnic group N= 482	Asian	26	5.36%
	Black	4	.82%
	Hispanic	3	.62%
	Native American	2	.41%
	White	442	91.13%
	Other	5	1.03%
Terminal Degree N= 485	Ph.D.	471	97.11%
	Masters	9	1.86%
	Bachelors	5	1.03%
Tenure Status N= 484	Tenured	387	79.79%
	Untenured	97	20%
Rank N= 483	Professor	217	44.74%
	Associate Professor	166	34.23%
	Assistant Professor	95	19.59%
	Other	5	1.03%
AGE N= 477	Mean	47.857	
	SD	9.558	
	Min-max	28-73	
Was Research assistant before joining faculty N= 477	Yes	221	45.57%
	No	256	52.78%
Was Teaching assistant before joining faculty N= 48	Yes	356	73.4%
	No	127	26.19%

Chairperson roles that facilitate tenure. The results of the study indicate that the majority of all respondents (faculty from all four disciplines) perceived that 13 of the 19 chair roles would assist or had assisted them in attaining tenure. Almost half (46.15%) of the roles identified as facilitating tenure were administrative roles of the chair. Research roles of the chair were the next most noted choice (38.46%). One teaching role (7.69%) and one service role (7.69%) were perceived as facilitation roles. (See Table 2 for a listing of the 13 roles in rank order.)

Table 2

Roles of the Department Chair Perceived by Faculty as Facilitating Tenure		
	Rank order of affirmative responses by all respondents (this role assisted me or would assist me in attaining tenure).	% of Yes responses
1.	Keeps faculty member informed of progress toward tenure. (A)	82.45%
2.	Provides monetary support for faculty participation in regional and national professional meetings (R)	81.22%
3.	Conducts annual review (A)	79.34%
4.	Supports faculty proposal for institutional funding (R)	77.26%
5.	Fosters the development of department faculty's special talents and interests (A)	76.96%
6.	Encourages faculty to submit proposals for contracts and grant to government agencies and private foundations. (R)	73.46%
7.	Serves as department advocate to upper level administration (R)	71.47%
8.	Communicates department needs to the dean (A)	65.76%
9.	Keeps faculty informed of department and institutional plans, expectations (A)	64.27%
10.	Develops and implements long range programs, plans and goals (A)	59.83%
11.	Assigns course loads and number of preparations (T)	58.81%
12.	Establishes departmental committees (S)	55.74%
13.	Serves as research role model (R)	52.58%

Perceptions of facilitation roles by tenure status. Of the thirteen roles identified as facilitative roles of the chair, twelve roles showed significant differences by tenure status (See Table 3). In all cases, tenure-track faculty were more likely to answer YES than tenured faculty. Therefore, tenure-track faculty perceived these facilitation roles of the

Table 3
Comparison of Percentage of Affirmative Responses
by Tenure Status

	This role assisted me or would assist me in attaining tenure.	N=	Tenured Faculty	Tenure track faculty	Chi-square	p<
1.	Assign number of courses per year and number of preparations.	351	55.71%	71.83%	6.081	*
2.	Observes in the classroom.	368	26.53%	35.14%	2.159	
3.	Serves as a role model in the area of teaching.	358	25.00	37.88%	4.491	*
4.	Conducts annual review	425	75.29%	95.29%	16.567	***
5.	Reviews mid-year progress	372	28.62%	44.00%	6.540	*
6.	Keeps faculty member informed of progress toward tenure	415	79.20%	95.35%	12.529	***
7.	Monitors work load	339	40.44%	73.13%	23.072	***
8.	Supports faculty's proposal for institutional funding	409	72.84%	94.12%	17.353	***
9.	Provides monetary support for participation in national and regional professional meetings.	425	78.47%	93.02%	9.606	**
10.	Encourages faculty members to submit proposals for contracts and grants.	406	69.85%	88.89%	12.114	**
11.	Serves as a role model in the area of research.	387	48.05%	70.89%	13.152	***
12.	Fosters the development of faculty's special talents and interests	369	73.90%	89.19%	7.802	**

note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$ In every case, degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 1

Table 3
(continued)
Comparison of Percentage of Affirmative Responses
by Tenure Status

	This role assisted me or would assist me in attaining tenure.	N=	Tenured Faculty	Tenure track faculty	Chi-square	p<
13.	Brings in visiting lecturers, seminars, and workshops for faculty development.	365	44.56%	66.79%	9.371	*
14.	Recruits and selects departmental faculty members.	353	34.40%	28.17%	.993	
15.	Establishes department committees that enhance the functioning of department	366	55.03%	58.82%	.322	
16.	Keeps faculty members informed of department, college, and institutional plans, activities and expectations.	375	60.87%	77.63%	7.414	*
17.	Serves as an advocate for the department with the administration.	374	67.89%	85.33%	8.929	**
18.	Communicates department needs to the dean.	367	62.16%	80.28%	8.339	**
19.	Develops and implements long-range department programs, plans and goals.	350	55.94%	78.13%	10.721	**
note:	* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$		In all cases the degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 1			

chairs as more important than did tenured faculty.

The most striking finding is that both tenured and tenure-track faculty picked the same five chair's roles as facilitating tenure acquisition: 1) conducts annual review, 2) keeps faculty member informed of progress toward tenure, 3) supports faculty's proposal for institutional funding, 4) provides monetary support for participation in national and regional professional meetings, and 5) fosters the development of faculty's special talents and interests. However, each group picked the roles in somewhat different order. Both groups identified the chair's role of keeping the faculty member informed of progress toward tenure as the most useful or helpful for tenure acquisition. Tenured faculty then indicated monetary support for professional meetings, an annual review, and support of proposals for institutional funding. Tenure-track faculty indicated that conduct of the annual review would be the second most helpful, followed by support of proposals for institutional funding and then money for professional meetings. Both groups indicated the fifth most helpful role was for the chair to foster individual faculty's development.

Relationship of departmental affiliation to facilitation roles. Preliminary results obtained from chi-square tests showed statistically significant results concerning twelve of the thirteen facilitation roles of the chair (See Table 4). The role termed "provides monetary support for faculty participation in regional and national professional meetings" was excluded because all respondents felt it was important (81.22% overall) and no distinction by departmental affiliation was made.

Tukey's comparison of means procedure was utilized to identify the specific departments/disciplines causing the effects. The most profound effects were evidenced in the relationship between chemistry versus (v.) economics respondents and computer science v. economics respondents and their perceptions of which chair roles were facilitative. For ten of twelve facilitation roles (primarily research and administrative), chemistry v. economics respondents and computer science v. economics respondents were significantly different in their responses. Thus, the study's findings reinforce the notion that there is a difference between hard-pure (chemistry) and hard-applied (computer science) v. soft-applied (economics) departments categorized by the Biglan classification.

The next most significant difference was found between English (soft-pure) v. economics (soft-applied). These respondents differed significantly on five roles (four administrative and one service). Chemistry (hard-pure) and English (soft-pure) respondents differed on 3 roles (2 research, 1 administrative) . Chemistry (hard-pure) v. computer science (hard-applied) only differed on one role (teaching). Computer science (hard-applied) and English (soft-pure) only differed on one role (research).

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that faculty believe that the department chair can and should play an important role in tenure acquisition. However, some faculty are concerned that their chair may lack the "know-how" and/or the authority to carry out their duties, let alone facilitate tenure acquisition. Several comments from this study supported this notion:

Table 4
Comparison of Percentage of Affirmative Responses
by Departmental Affiliation

This role assisted me or would assist me in attaining tenure		N=	CHEM	COMP SCI	ECON	ENG	Chi-square	p<
1.	Assign number of courses per year and number of preparations.	352	55.71%	45.65%	53.73%	57.32%	11.936	**
2.	Observes in the classroom.	369	41.03%	20.83%	32.39%	22.67%	10.838	*
3.	Serves as a role model in the area of teaching.	359	46.58%	36.73%	22.67%	17.90%	23.886	***
4.	Conducts annual review.	426	90.11%	80.65%	73.81%	76.19%	9.216	*
5.	Reviews mid-year progress	372	38.75%	41.18%	23.38%	29.27%	6.861	
6.	Keeps faculty member informed of progress toward tenure	416	87.64%	92.86%	74.12%	80.65%	10.347	*
7.	Monitors work load	339	49.32%	52.17%	39.19%	47.95%	2.515	
8.	Supports faculty's proposal for institutional funding.	409	87.36%	86.21%	65.48%	75.00%	14.853	**
9.	Provides money for national professional meetings	426	81.11%	86.89%	83.33%	78.53%	2.434	
10.	Encourages faculty to submit proposals for contracts and grants.	407	95.60%	82.54%	58.23%	65.52%	40.589	***
11.	Serves as a role model in the area of research.	388	69.41%	63.64%	41.46%	45.78%	19.495	***

note: * p< .05, ** p< .01, *** p< .001 degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 3 in every case

Table 4
(continued)
Comparison of Percentage of Affirmative Responses
by Departmental Affiliation

This role assisted me or would assist me in attaining tenure	N=	CHEM	COMP SCI	ECON	ENG	Chi-square	p<
12. Fosters the development of faculty' special interests.	369	82.93%	86.96%	63.64%	77.44%	11.971	**
13. Brings in outside lecturers, plans seminars for faculty development.	365	63.64%	68.00%	47.37%	35.80%	25.171	***
14. Recruits and selects new faculty.	354	38.27%	36.00%	31.51%	30.00%	1.904	
15. Establishes departmental committees that enhance functioning of department	366	74.36%	53.70%	28.77%	59.63%	33.565	***
16. Keeps faculty members informed of department and institutional plans.	375	79.75%	73.58%	43.42%	63.47%	24.674	***
17. Serves as an advocate for the department with administration.	375	79.22%	77.19%	55.13%	73.62%	13.768	**
18. Communicates department needs to dean.	368	79.01%	75.93%	43.24%	66.04%	25.465	***
19. Develops and implements L-R plans.	351	75.00%	70.59%	39.47%	58.78%	22.904	***

note: * p< .05, ** p< .01, *** p< .001 degrees of freedom (d.f.) = 3 in every case

> It would be extremely useful to provide leadership training for those in the department chair's role. At our institution, this is never done, and we suffer as a result.

> In general, chairpersons are too weak, too much limited to managing, They need more power and more commitment... ..the chairs have the true responsibilities but neither the needed resources nor the power to discharge these responsibilities.

Faculty in this study also expressed the need to have their chair secure funding for various events (e.g., providing monetary support for professional meetings). This is unlikely to happen in many institutions due to the fact that departmental resources are diminishing (Creswell, 1990).

The socialization process. Perceptions of faculty members in this study reinforce the belief that the department chair both could and should serve as a mentor for junior faculty. The literature on department chairs, especially in the last few years, has shown a dramatic increase in the notion that the chair can serve as mentor, socializing agent and supporter of junior faculty (Bennett & Figuili, 1990; Blackburn & Wylie, 1990; Neumann & Finaly-Neumann, 1991; Smart, 1990; and Whitt, 1991). Several comments by respondents also indicated the need for the chair to act as facilitator or mentor. The following comment is representative:

> Our department has a "sink or swim" attitude towards assistant professors. This is fostered by the chair's attitude. Very little mentoring, role modeling or assistance is given to the assistant professor.

Despite the findings from this study and others that identified the chairs' facilitative role as desirable, the socialization process has largely been left to chance and/or left to attempts at adept recruiting (Browne and Reed 1992; Burke, 1987; Connolly, 1969; Whitt 1991)). This attitude may be changing because of current faculty shortages and predictions of a dearth of faculty in the near future (Bowen & Schuster, 1986; Mooney, 1989).

There is also a gender-related socialization concern. As one female respondent commented:

> ... my observation in 20 years (as a G.A., instructor, & assist. professor) is that male chairs actively mentor their male faculty members but not their female faculty members (I have been liked - & called on for endless service - by male chairs - but they have not been mentors!). (English)

Lovano-Kerr and Fuchs (1983) discovered this same phenomenon in their 1979 and 1981 studies. As Bolton (1982) explained, "it has been pointed out that men provide the most likely source of mentors because of the lack of women in high level positions" (p. 205). Therefore, until women rise to the rank of professor at the same pace as men, men will need

to mentor women.

Institutional leaders and department faculty must confront these socialization issues if they wish to treat tenure-track faculty as "valued resources" rather than as "disposable goods" (Burke 1987, 21). Department chairs will be increasingly challenged to lead the way in acclimating and socializing new faculty.

Chair facilitation roles by disciplinary differences. This study's findings also indicate how the role of the department chair in facilitating tenure acquisition can vary by discipline. This study showed that there is a decidedly significant difference between how hard-pure departments (chemistry) v. soft-applied (economics) and how hard-applied (computer science) v. soft applied (economics) perceived the facilitation roles of the chair. In addition, this study showed instances of differences between all four types of disciplinary types represented in this study (soft-pure v. soft-applied; hard-pure v. soft-pure; hard-pure v. hard-applied, hard-applied v. soft-pure). Responses from chemistry and computer science faculty (hard/pure and hard/applied) indicated that the chair was seen as very important in facilitating tenure acquisition. English faculty perceived selected roles as important (e.g., mostly administrative roles). Economics respondents were the least likely to perceive any of the chair's roles as facilitating tenure (7 of the 19). Therefore, this study confirms the work of others including Becher, (1987), Biglan (1973), Clark, (1986, 1987, 1989), Kolb (1981), Light (1974), Lodahl and Gordon (1972) who suggested that there are differences according to one's academic disciplines as how one performs his or her duties as an academic.

Tenure v. tenure track faculty. Findings from this study suggest that although tenured faculty perceive the facilitative roles of the chair to be valuable, tenure-track faculty see a greater importance in the chair's facilitative roles. Considering the stakes involved (tenure), this finding is not surprising.

The findings also support the fact that there are greater pressures and more guidelines today for achieving tenure than in previous decades. According to O'Neill (1990), "scholarly productivity" is the most important aspect in achieving tenure and faculty perceive enormous pressure to publish (p. 55). Respondents' comments, as well as the finding that all faculty in this study believed that 55 percent or more of their workload is spent toward research efforts (See Table 5 on workload and tenure) support this notion:

> ...To achieve tenure in this institution one need not have any service, and need only demonstrate minimal competence as a teacher...(English)
>
> We have new workload policies now. Most English faculty were, however, tenured under 100% teaching criteria over 10 years ago. (English)
>
> Note: research is the only consideration for tenure that actually seems to count. (English)

Also. most of the roles perceived by faculty as facilitating tenure related to facilitating one's research agenda and tenure progress. This supports Hoshmand and Hartman's (1990) study

Table 5
Workload & Tenure
How much (%) each area contributes to achieving tenure

Chemistry N=105			
	Mean	SD	Min-max
Teaching	33.029	15.811	0-90
Research	55.743	17.576	10-95
Service	11.124	7.245	0-33
Computer Science N = 63			
	Mean	SD	Min-max
Teaching	29.220	18.500	1-90
Research	56.762	22.287	1-98
Service	13.968	8.527	0-33
Economics N = 97			
	Mean	SD	Min-max
Teaching	30.854	17.463	0-98
Research	58.701	20.387	1-100
Service	10.485	8.344	0-33
English N = 215			
	Mean	SD	Min-max
Teaching	28.649	14.477	0-90
Research	58.813	19.170	0-100
Service	12.423	8.609	0-40

of tenured and probationary faculty, which found that probationary faculty experienced greater pressure to produce (p.39).

Implications for Practice

The results of this study suggest that chairpersons would benefit greatly from

discussion and training addressing some of the duties outlined in this study. Chairs need to examine what roles they are currently performing and determine if they are doing enough to meet the needs of their faculty, especially those who are seeking tenure. Also, there were several facilitation roles that called for the chair to be a manager, e.g., developing long range programs, plans and goals. The chair should be trained to manage and utilize his/her resources efficiently. Other chair roles, such as serving as an advocate and communicating with the dean as well as keeping the faculty informed of their progress toward tenure, require good communication skills. Training in interpersonal communication skills could prove advantageous to most chairs. As Lucas (1990) stated, "The department chair can be the most effective agent of change in a college or university...but to be effective, chairs require empowerment, knowledge and leadership skills" (p. 81).

Information gained in this study about the chair's facilitation role may be helpful for administrators, such as senior-level decision makers (vice presidents), deans, and department chairs, of Doctorate-Granting I institutions because it provides insight into what faculty believe the chair should be doing to assist in the success of a significant group (i.e., tenure-track) of faculty. The thirteen roles found to be facilitative roles of the chair should contribute to future planning, prioritizing, and defining the role of the chair. For example, the majority of all faculty would like to see their chairs conducting annual reviews as well as keeping the tenure-track faculty informed of their progress toward tenure.

Tenure-track, junior faculty should also find information about the facilitation role of the chair helpful because it indicates the kind of assistance they should solicit and perhaps expect from their chair. Many prospective faculty could ask about the chair's role in facilitating tenure when they apply for a job. Essentially, junior faculty need to fight the traditional expectations of "sink or swim" and isolation (Whitt, 1991) and seek help when it is needed.

Implications for Future Research

This study found that the majority of faculty from all departments were teaching assistants before becoming faculty members. It also determined that chemistry faculty (hard/pure) were most likely to have been research assistants followed by computer science (hard/applied) and economics (soft/applied). The majority of English (soft/pure) professors were not research assistants (RA) before becoming faculty members. However, the majority of all faculty were teaching assistants before becoming faculty. Also, the tenure-track faculty were more likely to have been a research or teaching assistant than were tenured faculty. Future research should attempt to ascertain how important it is to the socialization process to be a research or teaching assistant before becoming a faculty member. Also, it would be helpful to find out if having been a research or teaching assistant has an impact on one's success in achieving tenure.

Ideally, faculty from all types of institutions should be studied. It was noted in this study that only Doctorate-Granting I institutions were studied to control for variance due to institutional type. The effects of department size, type of the university (public or private) and the highest degree awarded could have a significant effect on faculty perceptions of the

chair's role. As Hayward (1986) found in studying two distinct Biglan departmental types, "chairpersons from departments of similar size could have more in common with one another than with those from similar disciplines" (p.145). Respondent comments from this study support this notion. There were many comments about the importance of size in determining the role of the chair. Therefore, another potential area of research is testing Biglan's model on faculty from several different types of institutions, different sizes of departments and the level of degrees awarded.

The role of senior faculty in assisting junior faculty in achieving tenure should also be investigated. Browne and Reed (1992) implied that senior faculty could play a significant role in that process. One respondent from this study commented, "Someone(s) should (and does in my department) observe junior faculty's teaching, but not necessarily the chair (the chair appoints colleagues to do this)" (English). It appears that as the size of the department increases, the need for assistance from senior faculty to acclimate junior faculty increases, too (according to respondent comments). Thus, senior faculty should be studied as to their potential interest and desire to assist junior faculty on the road to tenure.

Finally, chairs should be questioned on their perceptions of their role in tenure acquisition. It is important to ask the chairs to comment on what they think they can do to assist junior faculty. It would also be helpful to review the roles examined in this study and find out which roles the chairs think can be carried out.

References

Atelsek, F.J., & Gomberg, I.L. (1980). *Tenure practices at four-year colleges and universities*. (Higher Education Panel Report No. 48). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

American Association of University Professors. (1984). *1982 recommended institutional regulations on academic freedom and tenure*. (AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1984 edition). Washington, DC: AAUP.

Becher, T. (1981). Towards a definition of disciplinary cultures. *Studies in Higher Education*, 6, 109-122.

Bennett, J.B. (1989). About department chairs. *AAHE Bulletin*, 42(2), 9-11.

Bennett,J.B., & Figuili, D.J. (1990). *Enhancing departmental leadership: The roles of the chairperson*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company/ACE.

Bess, J. L. (1978). Anticipatory socialization of graduate students. *Research in Higher Education*, 8, 289-317.

Blackburn, R. T., & Wylie, N. R. (1990). Current appointment and tenure practices: Their impact on new faculty careers. *CUPA Journal*, 41(3), 9-20.

Biglan, A. (1973a). The Characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 195-203.

Biglan, A. (1973b). Relationship between subject matter characteristics and the structure and output of university departments. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57, 204-213.

Blackburn, R. T., & Wylie, N. R. (1990). Current appointment and tenure practices: Their impact on new faculty careers. *CUPA Journal*, 41(3), 9-20.

Bolton, E. B. (1982). A conceptual analysis of the mentor relationship in the career development of woman. *Adult Education*, 50, 195-207.

Bowen, H. R., & Schuster, J. H. (1986). *American Professors: A National Resource Imperiled*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bragg, A. K. (1981, March). *The socialization of academic department heads: Past patterns and future possibilities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, DC.

Brann, J. (1972). The chairman: An impossible job about to become tougher. In J. Brann & T. Emmett (Eds.), *The academic department or division chairmen: A complex role* (pp. 5-27). Detroit: Balamp.

Browne, M. N., & Reed, J. D. (1992, February). *Providing a spirit of community for young faculty*. Paper presented at the annual Academic Chairpersons Conference, Orlando.

Burke, D. L. (1987, February). *Disposable goods or valued resource: Appointment and termination of assistant professors*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Diego.

Chait, R. P., & Ford, A. T. (1984). Tenure in context. In M.J. Finkelstein (Ed.) *ASHE Reader on Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities, 2nd ed* (pp. 171-182). Massachusetts: Ginn Press.

Clark, B. R. (1985, September/October). Listening to the professoriate. *Change*, pp. 36-45.

Clark, B. R. (1987). *The academic life*. New Jersey: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, B. R. (1989). The academic life: Small worlds, different worlds. *Educational Researcher*, 18(5), 4-8.

Connolly, J. J. (1969). *Viewing faculty orientation as a socialization process.* (Report JC 690-266), U.S. Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Office of Education. ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 031 226)

Creswell, J. W., & Bean, J. P. (1981). Research output, socialization, and the Biglan model. *Research in Higher Education*, 15, 69-92.

Creswell, J. W., Wheeler, D. W. Seagren, A. T., Egly, N. J., & Beyer, K. D. (1990). *The Academic Chairperson's Handbook*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Hayward, P. C. (1986). A discriminant analytic test of Biglan's theoretical distinction between Biology and English department chairpersons. *Research in Higher Education*, 25, 136-146.

Heimler, C. F. (1972). The college departmental chairman. In J.Brann & T. Emmett (Eds.) *The academic department or division chairmen: A complex role* (pp. 158-163). Detroit: Balamp.

Hill, W. W., & French, W. L. (1967). Perception of power of departmental chairmen by professors. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 11, 548-574.

Hoshmand, L. T., & Hartman, M. (1990). Planning for faculty development at a comprehensive state university. *Planning for Higher Education*, 18(4), 31-45.

Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning styles and disciplinary differences. In A. W. Chickering (Ed.), *The Modern American College* (pp. 232-255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Light, D. W., Jr., (1974). The structure of the academic professions. *Sociology of Education*, 47, 2-28.

Lincoln, Y. S. (1986). The ladder and the leap. *Educational Horizons*, Spring, 113-116.

Lodahl, J. B., & Gordon, G. (1972). The structure of scientific fields and the functioning of university graduate departments. *American Sociological Review*. 37, 57-72.

Lovano-Kerr, J., & Fuchs, R. G. (1983). Retention revisited: A study of female and male nontenured faculty. *Journal of Educational Equity and Leadership*, 3, 219-230.

Lucas, A.F. (1990). The department chair as change agent. In P. Seldin (Ed.), *How administrators can improve teaching: Moving from talk to action in higher education* (pp. 63-88). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

McLaughlin, G. W., Montgomery, J. R., & Malpass, L. F. (1975). Selected characteristics, roles, goals, and satisfactions of department chairmen in State and Land-Grant institutions. *Research in Higher Education*, 3, 243-259.

Mooney, C. J. (1989, January). Uncertainty is rampant as colleges begin to brace for faculty shortage expected to begin in 1990's. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. p. A16-A17.

Neal, J. E. (1991, April). *Gender Segregation among disciplinary groups in Liberal Arts Colleges: An examination of differences in career concepts and work values*. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.

Neumann, Y., & Finaly-Neumann, E. (1990). The support-stress paradigm and faculty research publication. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61, 565-580.

O'Neill, G. P. (1990). Publish or perish: dispelling the myth. *Higher Education Review*, 23, 55-62.

Roach, J. H. L. (1976, Winter). The academic department chairperson: Functions and responsibilities. *Educational Record*, pp. 13-23.

Shulman, C. H. (1979). *Old expectations, new realties: The academic profession revisited.* (Report No. 2). Washington, D.C.: George Washington University, AAHE-ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 169-874).

Siever, R. G., Loomis, R. J., & Neidt, C. O. (1972). Role perceptions of department chairmen in two land grant universities. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 65 405-410.

Smart, J. C., & Elton, C. F. (1976). Administrative roles of department chairmen. in J.C. Smart and J.R. Montgomery (Eds.) *Examining Departmental Management*. New Directions for Institutional Research (pp. 39-60) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Smart, J. C. (1990). A casual model of faculty turnover intentions. *Research in Higher Education*, 31, 405-423.

Tucker, A. (1984) *Chairing the academic department* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Van Alstyne, W. (1971). Tenure: A summary, explanation and "defense". In M.J.Finkelstein (Ed.) *ASHE Reader on Faculty and Faculty Issues in Colleges and Universities, 2nd ed.* (pp. 165-170). Massachusetts: Ginn Press.

Van Maanen, J. (1976). Breaking-in: Socialization to work. In R. Dubin (Ed.), *Handbook of Work, Organization and Society* (pp.67-130). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Wheeler, S. (1966). The structure of formally organized socialization settings. In O.G. Brim & S. Wheeler (Eds.) (pp. 51-116). *Socialization after childhood, two essays*. New York: Wiley.

Whitt, E. J. (1991). Hit the ground running: Experiences of new faculty in a school of education. *The Review of Higher Education*, 14, 177-197.

Wylie, N. R. (1985). *Helping new faculty adjust to careers at Liberal Arts Colleges*. (Project Summary). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Great Lake Colleges Association.